PENN STATE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Monstrous Theories:: Werewolves and the Abuse of History

Author(s): Willem de Blécourt

Source: *Preternature: Critical and Historical Studies on the Preternatural*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (2013), pp. 188-212

Published by: Penn State University Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/preternature.2.2.0188

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Penn State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Preternature: Critical and Historical Studies on the Preternatural*

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

MONSTROUS THEORIES: WEREWOLVES AND THE ABUSE OF HISTORY

Willem de Blécourt

ABSTRACT

The amount of popular, "scientific" werewolf theories is inversely proportional to serious investigations into the history of the werewolf. A critical approach of these theories leaves them all wanting. Although they pretend to offer valid insights, the little that is known about (primarily European) werewolf lore contradicts their basic assumptions. Because of their visual emphasis, popular werewolf theories relate more to the depiction of werewolves in twentieth-century films, in which the werewolf image was reinvented, than to werewolves as they are, or are not, described in archival sources. There is little hope that the criticized theories will wither in the future, but they need to be exposed at least once. And they do show how popular werewolf films are among werewolf exegetes.

KEYWORDS

Werewolves; werewolf syndrome; monsters; medical theory; films; history

I

Publications about werewolves can be divided into several categories. The bulk of them are written by amateurs, aimed at a popular market and with the purpose of making some quick money.[1] Serious academic works are extremely scarce and the few titles available are mostly articles rather than books; they are as a rule not read by popularizers, who tend to favor older works that are regularly reprinted.[2] Academic publications mostly stem from different disciplines: history,[3] folklore,[4] and literary and cultural studies.[5] There is very little exchange between the three, which is understandable because each discipline is concerned with quite different werewolves. Those werewolves that feature in modern literature and films can be readily distinguished from those that are the

PRETERNATURE, Vol. 2, No. 2, 2013
Copyright © 2013 The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

subject of early modern trial records and nineteenth- and twentieth-century folklore texts by the mechanism of the metamorphosis. Historians (witchcraft historians, to be precise), however, rarely venture into the field of folklore and vice versa. Then again, the werewolves of classical and medieval literature[6] are studied by classicists and medieval literary historians, who in their turn rarely communicate with folklorists or witchcraft historians. Moreover, there is a language problem since German publications are often inaccessible to Anglo-Saxon scholars. These are, of course, generalizations, but they justify the conclusion that the field is fragmented and underdeveloped. At least amateur authors attempt to be inclusive.

What stands out in the flood of recent popular werewolf publications is that their authors, apart from occasionally branching out to people who are shifting into other animals, pay abundant attention to fiction, especially as expressed on television and in the cinema, and to "scientific" theories about the beast's origin. Indeed, the screen werewolf, the man or woman who has been bit by a werewolf and at the next full moon is doomed to turn into a werewolf too, can be considered as one of the best-known human monsters.[7] This article purports to show that the theories are as much fiction as are the films. That the present-day prevalent image of the werewolf has mainly been propagated through the films and is not rooted in an ancient tradition, is an interesting aside, but will be addressed only in as far as it has a bearing on the theories.

A special group of amateur werewolf authors are medical doctors. Not having been trained in either history of folklore (or cultural studies), they have used selective texts to diagnose "the werewolf." One of the results is that werewolf publications are now saddled with what is confusingly called "the werewolf syndrome," namely hypertrichosis,[8] a rare somatic condition that leaves its sufferers with hair either all over their body or in places where it usually does not grow. Here, I am not so much concerned with the discussion whether the category "monster" would be helpful in understanding the concept, or better *concepts* of werewolves, the plural because the werewolf is a multiple creature that has varied through history. I merely want to address the question as to why medical diagnoses have been formulated in connection to werewolves and why they have been given more attention by authors of popular werewolf books than those of serious historical publications. For werewolves are not just linked to hypertrichosis, they are also connected to another very rare condition, "congenital erythropoietic porphyria" (or CEP).[9] Further, within psychiatry there is now a recognized affliction called "lycanthropy,"[10] denoting humans who are under the delusion that they have changed into a number of animals, among them

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

a wolf.[11] Between the medical literature and the popular publications, several more "scientific explanations" for the werewolf phenomenon can be found, such as ergot poisoning, rabies, and hysteria. Also mention is made of cryptozoology, in which werewolves are seen as a separate, if not yet completely discovered species.[12] The thought that feral children gave rise to the werewolf phenomenon had some adherents in the 1970s but is now less championed, and that primarily on the European side of the Atlantic Ocean.[13] If any corroborating evidence for these theories is presented, which often it is not, it is usually historical albeit second- or third-hand. The scope of this essay is therefore historiographic; it focuses on modern theories about "the werewolf" and the way they are validated, rather than on finding possible new, or neglected evidence that may justify one or more theories.

In the following pages I will concentrate on the several arguments on which werewolf theories are built, as well as on the strength of the evidence their authors supply. As the latter can only be anecdotal, for even the most extended historical werewolf cases can never provide sufficient material for materialistic or psychiatric evaluations, the quest for hard medical historical evidence is a lost cause from the start. The authors of the above theories did not even get as far as asking what kind of sources there would be to help answer their queries, let alone contemplating their problematic nature. Often they did not take too much trouble to research werewolf history at all, yet they all pretended to make statements about werewolves wherever and whenever. To give one example among many: in another essay on porphyria it is simply stated, "In Europe and small villages, the congenital form of the disorder may be responsible for the origin of the werewolf and the legends that have ensued to this day."[14] While this author (an associate professor at the department of periodontics at the Baylor College of Dentistry in Dallas) does not cite any historical research, it does not mean that that there are no sources for a history of werewolves at all, just that they have not been accessed. But the documentation that is available often points into a different direction than the theories, or "explanations." Because of this lack of historical research, it would be easy to ignore this particular kind of literature. Better, however, to analyze the coherence of a presentation and try and find a contemporaneous rationale for it. I will argue that for a decisive part werewolf theories are based on twentieth-century films and have to be assessed accordingly.

The engagement with modern materialistic werewolf theories will take up all the space of this essay. Serious historians and folklorists are not generally bothered with dissecting popular theories, but because werewolf studies are

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

so underdeveloped, it has to be done at least once. Possible alternative, more culturally oriented explanations of historical werewolves will not be advanced. They require the length of several other essays, or an entire book. The present essay can nevertheless be considered as an investigation in the reception of werewolf films and as such it certainly has a cultural component.

II

The porphyria thesis and the related theory about hypertrichosis have become the most popular ways of subjecting the werewolf to a scientific discourse. Patients with CEP "have traits resembling werewolves, including hypertrichosis, photosensitivity, sores, scars and discolored skin," as an overview of the different porphyrias has it.[15] It is also mentioned in medical handbooks.[16] Examples of this have trickled down into the popular domain. In the latest subject-specific encyclopedia, porphyria features as the only remaining materialist explanation, of which it is stated, "The symptoms are consistent with descriptions of werewolves in older literature."[17]

The "superstition" or "belief" (which is hardly less neutral), it is argued, is so prevalent and persistent that there must be something tangible behind it. As the London physician Illis, who first suggested the porphyria connection, wrote in 1963, "A belief as widespread both in time and place as that of the werwolf [Illis's spelling] must have some basis in fact. Either werwolves exist or some phenomenon must exist or have existed on which, by the play of fear, superstition and chance, a legend was built and grew."[18] On the basis of various descriptions Illis constructed a composite picture of a werewolf: pale, yellow or greenish skin, numerous excoriations, red mouth, unsteady eyes, occasionally hairy. Most of these characteristics are derived from a late nineteenth-century Dutch report concerning the Indonesian island of Celebes,[19] which Illis did not acknowledge in his references. The excoriations are taken from the sixteenth-century French lawyer Henry Boguet, who ascribed them, according to Illis, to physical causes following encounters with wolves or humans, not to any illness.[20] Since the "werwolf" from mid-Celebes was not even a wolf, but only a translation of a local term, denoting someone who can change into a cat, boar, monkey, deer, water buffalo, crocodile, or ant heap, Illis appears not to have been too concerned with European werewolves, but to have specifically drawn his werewolf picture to fit porphyria symptoms. The most important characteristic of the Celebes *taoe mepongko* is actually its large tongue, which has healing powers.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

This last detail is ignored by Illis, as it undermines his theory: "One is constantly met with conflicting evidence," he laments.[21]

Yet Illis's explanation lived on and was given a new slant by David Dolphin, a biochemist, at the 1985 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Surpassing Illis, Dolphin not very originally included vampires in his theory.[22] Their feasting on blood would have been equivalent to modern injections of red pigment and their creation of other vampires by their bite would have been consistent with the genetic pattern of the disease. When hairy—porphyria sufferers can develop hypertrichosis—they could also easily have been taken for werewolves. Dolphin's theory is even more off the mark than Illis's. As American folklorist Norine Dresser summarizes on the basis of specialists' statements:

> The medical objections to the relationship between vampire beliefs and porphyria symptoms are that the drinking of whole blood cannot satisfy the need for heme, a component of blood, which must be directly absorbed into the bloodstream; acute attacks cannot be induced by blood loss; porphyria patients do not have a thirst for blood; there is no clinical evidence to support the idea that garlic has an adverse effect on porphyria patients and the only form of porphyria which has the symptoms of photosensitivity, hairiness, pointy teeth, *and* a need for additional blood is CEP, the rarest form.[23]

Moreover, no werewolf (or vampire) has ever been reported to pass purple urine, the very symptom that gave porphyria its name. Dresser is especially keen to contradict Dolphin because his theory acquired nationwide news coverage and many actual porphyria patients became victims of ostracism or jokes about bloodsucking and howling at the full moon. The porphyria connection even made its way into an episode of the television series *St. Elsewhere*, in which a patient was seen to seek "medical assistance because there is a full moon and he fears that he may turn into a vampire or a werewolf."[24] Dolphin, who was called "irresponsible" by a porphyria specialist, defended himself by stating that he had not foreseen the concern of present-day sufferers. His hypothesis referred to the past: "Maybe this is what happened in the Middle Ages."[25] The consternation was very much confined to the United States. In Great Britain porphyria used to be associated with royalty rather than with vampires or werewolves. British werewolf writers habitually dismissed the connection.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

As a solution to the werewolf problem, hypertrichosis was part of the porphyria thesis, but gained some independent currency only in the early twenty-first century. Most popular werewolf books display pictures of hypertrichosis sufferers and many pretend that "in some cultures it was even believed that such children were werewolves."[26] The idea was further dispersed through crime fiction. Patricia Cornwell, for instance, featured a serial killer as suffering from hypertrichosis: "Hypertrichotic people can be overly sensitive to light and suffer anomalies of their teeth and genitalia. . . . In earlier centuries these wretched people were sold to carnivals or royal courts. Some were accused of being werewolves."[27] The first two sentences are correct but hardly relevant in relation to werewolves because there is no sign whatsoever that the last has ever been the case. Another example of the persistent circulation of the porphyria thesis can be found in an episode of the television series *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation* in which a woman with hypertrichosis is condemned to a life in isolation; she and her brother are called "werewolves."[28]

At early modern werewolf trials, whether criminal or about slander, evidence was always an issue, and so far no trial has surfaced in which hairiness is mentioned.[29] Moreover, the most substantial refutation of the above werewolf theories that can be found in these sources is that the werewolf metamorphosis is something temporary. It is never presented as a permanent state, or a "condition." In early modern and modern Europe people were deemed to turn into werewolves only for a certain period. They were mostly said to achieve this with the aid of wearing a skin or a belt, which indicates that they were not seen as hairy to start with. Historically a werewolf is a temporary disguise, a periodical change of identity.[30]

III

The idea that so-called "feral children," children who are left in the wild and raised by animals, gave rise to stories about werewolves probably goes back to the classic image of the Roman twins Romulus and Remus, who were suckled by a wolf. It will have been strengthened by Rudyard Kipling's late nineteenth-century *The Jungle Book*, which had the boy Mowgli growing up among wolves. There is nothing in the Roman myth of origin to suggest werewolves. Romulus and Remus did not enter mythology, literature, or history as shape-shifters and the same applies to Mowgli (also Disneyfied). Neither did any other feral

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

children whose history is known. Feral children have nevertheless become a staple ingredient of werewolf explanations. Their inability to communicate with humans, their diet of raw food, their hairy skin, and their animal posture are cited as "classic signs of the wolf–child, the lycanthrope, *homo ferus*."[31] According to Robert Eisler's theory, formulated in the 1940s, which interprets the werewolf as symbolizing the phase in man's evolution in which he turned violent, feral children could even have "taken the lead" in copying "the habits of the gregarious beasts of prey."[32] Again the evidence is very scanty. Only one French werewolf case is cited in support, that concerning fourteen-year-old Jean Grenier in 1603. Yet the applicability of this case is doubtful, since only one phase is referred to, namely a meeting between the French judge and demonologist De Lancre and Grenier seven years after the sentence of confinement in a monastery. At that point Jean was described as having deep and restless eyes and long and protruding teeth. His mind was completely barren, he ran on all fours and devoured raw meat. He was, however, capable of speech, as he had been at the time of his trial. He might well have been an "idiot" (in the parlance of the time) but as far as is known, after the death of his mother, he was raised by his father and not by wolves.[33] Irish author Bob Curran (who actually does not point at the Grenier connection) nevertheless thinks that feral children "had a profound influence on the perception of the werewolf," because they both blurred the human–animal distinction and because they reinforced the notion of a curse.[34] Unfortunately, until the theory was invented no werewolf was ever portrayed as having acquired his shape-shifting capacity during the early stages of his upbringing. And the curse belongs to the twentieth-century film repertoire, where it is linked to the recurring full moon.[35]

The case for rabies does not even attempt to rely on any sixteenth- or seventeenth-century source material. Its supporters presume a similarity of symptoms: the eating of "raw bloody meat, emitting bestial howls and indulging in unrestrained sexual attacks on any victim he can overpower," according to one author,[36] and extraordinary strength and ravening spasms according to another.[37] On a different level, "the close historical correlation between the werewolf trials in Europe and rabies epizootics" is raised.[38] But, on that particular issue, it would be extremely unlikely that at this stage of research, if ever, a match could be found. The current state of knowledge about werewolf trials, many of them in Germany, reveals a different distribution than the very fragmentary one on which the "correlation" is based.[39] A geographical method can be useful, but caution has to be exercised in making correlations.[40] In addition, a number of werewolf trials are too much entangled with witch trials for

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

one single medical cause to emerge. Moreover, the scale of both is unequal. Any explanation that relies on an epidemic can never be applied to werewolf trials because the accused in these did not act in packs. Already in the seventeenth century, rabies has been suggested as an explanation of why wolves would act unnaturally and thus be taken for werewolves.[41] Even if this would be applicable in the odd case, it still leaves the few hundred humans who were condemned as werewolves or were merely insulted for one. So far they have not been documented to have infected others with their werewolf affliction; that remained a characteristic of twentieth-century films.

IV

In theories about porphyria, hypertrichosis, feral children, or rabies, the experiences of people who would have designated others as werewolves take center stage: it is presumed that either they misinterpreted what they saw or that their senses were not functioning properly. Another set of theories is more concerned with werewolves themselves—that is, with how people could have harnessed the idea that they had become a wolf. The usual answer is that they had taken drugs.

One of the proponents of a hallucinogenic origin of changing into a werewolf was the American anthropologist Michael Harner (who later introduced the practice of a non-drug-induced shamanism into the Western world). In the early 1970s he reviewed "the werewolf literature to see if there might be a connection with hallucinogen use." He was inspired by "random accounts" about people who believed they had turned into an animal (fish, bird, and tiger) after the use of LSD.[42] As his is a rare example of the apparent citing of evidence from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources, I will give it an extensive discussion. A few years later psychiatrists Frida Surawicz and Richard Banta published two case histories of men who certainly identified themselves as werewolves, one of them having "a history of long and chronic drug abuse, including marijuana, amphetamines, psilocybin, and LSD." These authors, too, thought it "very likely that among the lycanthropes of antiquity were some 'trippers.'"[43] As Charlotte Otten wrote a decade later, "Throughout the long history of the disease, many lycanthropes confessed to using drugs or an ointment which they smeared on their bodies to initiate feelings of metamorphosis." She added, "Drug-induced transformations probably provided welcome release from normal ego boundaries, bringing lycanthropes into states of incredible power—a physical and

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

psychological power out of the range of normal, rational human experience."[44] This last explanation is more speculative than explanatory, notwithstanding its cautious formulation. Whether werewolves and witches actually used drugs, or whether these drugs produced the effects ascribed to them, is both controversial and highly questionable.

Since the use of drugs, more specifically the application of ointment by werewolves, was already being recorded in the sixteenth century, it may have a more solid basis than most of the other explanations under scrutiny here. But the lines of reasoning in support of it are not particularly strong. The quotation from Harner shows it to be a case of having an idea and then searching for supporting evidence. In this instance the idea originated from knowledge about, or experience with, the effects of hallucinogenic drugs, not from any familiarity with werewolves. As a consequence the evidence can be only selective. Although Harner gives the impression of quoting early modern authors firsthand, his quotations are in fact taken from *The Werewolf* by Montague Summers, of which an American edition had just appeared. Summers, however, because he wanted to stress the agency of the Devil, dismissed the drug thesis and found an authority who told him "that those witches' concoctions could of themselves not have any effect."[45] He mentioned only five French cases in which accused werewolves had used "a certain unguent," together with a number of demonologists who illustrated their arguments with the same cases and who used to copy one another. In quantitative terms these cases are not representative of all the werewolf trials. Even when new finds are included in which an ointment is mentioned, they never total more than 4 percent of all known werewolf trials. This can also be concluded without the extra trials not yet reported so far in the English werewolf literature. Adam Douglas, one of the more serious authors in the amateur field, pointed out that water and wolfskin were the traditional means for a werewolf to change and he considered the ointments an "imposition on popular beliefs by judges and inquisitors."[46]

Even if drugs were used only in a limited number of cases, it is unlikely that they could have had any substantial effect and could have contributed to the total picture of early modern werewolves. Authors who support the drug connection never refer to specific hallucinogens used in a particular case but to a general list of ingredients: "Belladonna and henbane, as well as aconite, opium, and hashish." Or more extensively, "Belladonna root, nightshade, the blood of bats and hoopoes, aconite, celery, soporific nightshade, soot, cinquefoil, calamus, parsley, poplar leaves, opium, henbane, hemlock, varieties of poppy, and crustaceans."[47] The pharmacological effects of these ingredients are never shown,

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

either singly or in combination. Occasionally it is pointed out that henbane and nightshade "contain powerful drugs,"[48] without substantiation or reference to a particular trial source. Instead, the symptoms of lycanthropy are brought into the equation. These symptoms, however, were not observed during trials but derived from an entirely different source, a much earlier medical text that describes its sufferers as "pale, their vision feeble, their eyes dry, tongue very dry, and the flow of the saliva stopped; but they are thirsty, and their legs have incurable ulcerations from frequent falls."[49] This medical definition of lycanthropy does not need to concur with the criminal description of werewolves.[50] The list of ingredients mentioned by Harner is taken from the seventeenth-century French author Jean de Nynauld, who in his turn obtained it from the sixteenth-century Dutch physician Johan Wier (also known as Weyer).[51] This explains the presence of celery and parsley, for Wier also mentioned that "chestnuts, beans, onions, cabbages and phasels" would cause turbulent dreams, his name for what was later called hallucinations. These vegetables are usually omitted from arguments about hallucinogens.

Information about werewolves' ointment was never obtained in a neutral situation but always during a trial. This implies that leading questions had been asked and torture used to solicit answers. Ultimately theories about "tripping" werewolves are based on reports of witch trials and need to take into account how the notion of ointments developed in these contexts. Harner was aware of the link with witch trials and indeed admitted that witches flying to their sabbat used the same recipe. He explained this away by stating, "The expectations and desires of the subject and the cues in his immediate environment strongly affect the nature of his experience"[52]—a mechanism that would surely have produced a greater variety of motifs than just flight and metamorphosis. Why was there never any mention of flying werewolves?

In fact, de Nynauld has always been quoted wrongly and the recipe referred to above was merely a witch's ointment. Had Harner actually consulted the sources he would not have had to explain the similarity between the recipes. According to de Nynauld, the ointment that would allow changing into animals never contained anything overtly hallucinatory but "certain things from a toad, a snake, a hedgehog, a wolf, fox and human blood, mixed with herbs and roots."[53] It appears that, to change into an animal, a substance from that animal was needed. In support of the desired link between werewolves and drug use, not only are very few sources consulted, but those sources that ostensibly support the thesis are quoted very selectively and in places wrongly, without taking their production into consideration.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Further instances of the disregard of original texts and contexts become clear when it is acknowledged that werewolves' actions are omitted from the symptoms and the influence of the Devil is not taken into account either. Harner also quotes Summers's summary of de Nynauld where it is concluded that "all shape-shifting is mere hallucination."[54] In the original seventeenth-century text, however, it is not so much "hallucination" as *prestigium* (meaning "illusion") that is the central term, and the latter is caused by the Devil and juxtaposed with God's miracles, which Summers glossed over and Harner forgot to mention. Ointments figured in early modern intellectual discussions because they pointed to the power of the Devil to cause illusions—that is to say, a disruption of the senses. The focus was not the possible hallucinatory effects of ingredients but whether observations were manipulated by the Devil.[55] This may be irrelevant for some present-day scholars, but it is vital for understanding early modern trial records. Drugs, moreover, are never evoked by the twentieth-century werewolf exegetes to explain the physical violence that their subjects exhibited, as for them it was only the werewolf's experience that counted and not his actions. Finally, in one of the earliest werewolf trials, the one from 1521 that is frequently referred to, the ointment was also used to change back from wolf into man.[56] This counter-drug is absent from any present-day discussion.

Modern authors favoring drug-using werewolves presumed that werewolves induced the change themselves. As Ian Woodward elaborated:

> It is interesting to note that a large proportion of suspected werewolves were shepherds, often mentally sub-normal and frequently psychologically deranged—easy victims for black magic rituals and the attendant incantations, unguents, and drugs. Shepherds, of course were in daily contact with the dreaded wolf. . . . It would be only natural that if they were to become involved in drug-taking rituals they would at some point imagine themselves to be metamorphosed into these wild beasts, which, in the victim's day-to-day occupations, brought such fear, depredation, and personal injury into their lives.[57]

There is a different reason for a slight preponderance of shepherds in werewolf trials. Shepherds often acted as wolf banners who turned away wolves from their flock; accordingly they could be accused to redirect wolves to neighboring flocks. In a next phase, which did not materialize everywhere, there was the possibility that they were suspected as wolves themselves.[58] "In any legitimate explanations," Sidky concluded, "the sociological correlates of accusations

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

of witchcraft and lycanthropy cannot be outweighed by the suspects' states of mind."[59] In other words, when a werewolf is considered as produced by an accusation, as a label put by some people on others, then it hardly matters whether the accused had themselves experienced a transformed state of consciousness. The whole aim of Renaissance prosecutors, on the other hand, was precisely to make their suspects confess their own guilt. Their criminal proceedings were especially suited to turn external designations into an internal identification.

The case for ergot poisoning at least includes both the subject's experience and society's assessment of it. The ergot, it is argued, caused werewolves "to act in other bizarre ways, even committing murder and injury. As a result, numerous victims of ergot poisoning were tried as wolves and werewolves—and executed."[60] Yet no contemporary text mentioned the fungus in relation to werewolves, though it was widely known and among other things used as an abortifacient. Douglas found the similarities between ergot victims and werewolves "more than somewhat strained." Referring to the then prevalent medical description, he points to the contrast between the "excessive salivation leading to frothing at the mouth" in ergot poisoning and the dry mouth of sufferers from lycanthropy.[61] Although it is questionable whether it is possible to apply this medical description to prosecuted werewolves, the notion of incompatibility is relevant. And there are other problems. Theories about the relation between witchcraft and ergot poisoning focus on the bewitched, or possessed, not on the presumed human perpetrator, the witch. When these theories are applied to werewolves, they should logically consider the werewolves' victims rather than the werewolves themselves. Moreover, large groups of sufferers feature as a major characteristic of the ergot argument. Unfortunately, in western Europe where most werewolves are located (also by ergot proponents), they were never reported as operating in packs but usually singly or at the most in pairs. The thirty thousand werewolves that are often mentioned in connection with the ergot theory are a historiographical fallacy.[62] They were thought to have been prosecuted in France during the sixteenth and early seventeenth century; the figure appeared in print only in the early 1970s, not as a result of intensive research into werewolf trials, but in all likelihood as an extrapolation of the number of inhabitants of the Labourd, who according to Pierre de Lancre in 1611 would all have been involved in witchcraft. The number of werewolf trials in France (Burgundy included) has never been properly counted, but based on the current state of research, fifty would not be an unreasonable estimate.[63] Without the extraordinary number of ailing werewolves, the ergot phenomenon can only said to have operated on a completely different scale.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Apart from some vague references in *Werewolves on Wheels* (USA 1971), werewolf films refrained from either introducing or quoting intoxicated werewolves, or onlookers. Harner, who refers to the 1589 Stump case in which the werewolf wore a girdle (but did not use any ointment), could also have looked at European nineteenth- and twentieth-century folklore material that informs on animal skins and belts;[64] it would have made a better comparison than the "LSD experiences in our culture."[65]

V

Over the last few decades psychiatrists have developed a largely self-referential body of literature on lycanthropy—that is to say, about people who think they have changed into some kind of animal.[66]

In some psychiatrical writings, the presentist sense of time that pervades the popular literature is even more pronounced, as history itself is put into parentheses. As it is stated, "Delusions of being a wolf or some other feared animal are universal"; or more subtly, "Psychodynamic interpretations parallel, to some extent, the theological ascription of lycanthropy to the influence of evil."[67]

The editor of a volume of werewolf texts ranging from antiquity to the twentieth century and covering most corners of Europe, Charlotte Otten, supposes that modern psychiatric cases of "lycanthropy" can help us to "understand lycanthropes and those who judged them" in earlier periods. Like the other authors who promote "scientific" explanations of werewolves, she assumes a material object that has stayed unchanged over the centuries: "the symptomatology remained stable," as she phrases it. If anything has evolved, she states, it is our understanding that has progressed from humoral pathology and evocation of the Devil to the achievements of modern medicine.[68] Ultimately this approach would make the study of psychiatric patients sufficient means to get a grip on historical werewolves. But in psychiatry werewolves again seem to fade away. Psychiatrists use the term "lycanthropy" for any kind of animal shape-shifting, "or the display of animal-like behaviour," whether it involves wolf, gerbil, dog, bird, cat, rabbit, or tiger—and lately also frog and bee. Attempts to substitute lycanthropy with therianthropy or zoomorphism failed.[69] Apart from one remark, namely "patients who present as household pets are a far cry from the werewolves of old,"[70] no visible discussion has touched on this. In my opinion, the only convincing example in support of this all-embracing theory is that of the woman who underwent behavioral changes from dog to cat to horse and

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

finally to wolf.[71] This seems to be a unique case, however; instances of so-called partial lycanthropy are more frequent.[72] The speculation "that the species of animal chosen may have specific psychological implication in individual cases" still needs to be borne out by research.[73]

Any connection with early modern werewolves is in any case flawed, since they mainly declared themselves as such under torture. Otten, moreover, clearly does not want to fall back totally on psychiatry, for that would make most of the texts in her collection redundant. Her argument nevertheless remains ahistorical: writings drawn together from so wide a range of periods run the risk of losing their historicity and becoming mythical, or, in this case, moral. "Almost all the writers on lycanthropy," she writes, allude to "the ongoing internal struggle between the forces of good and evil."[74] Significantly, when Otten compiled her reader, she was working at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan—a bulwark of orthodox Protestantism.

Since each of the different explanations makes little sense on its own, how do they look in combination? This at least was the approach adopted by the English sociologists W. M. S. and Claire Russell, who were critical of a psychiatric overview that paid attention only to lycanthropy and porphyria and disregarded rabies, ergotism, and the possible effect of hallucinogenic ointments.[75] Yet in their own treatment of werewolves this combined approach does not provide any additional value. On ergot poisoning they conclude: "Clearly it would only need a few such episodes to give currency to a belief in the actual transformation of werewolves." In the case of hallucinogens: "anyone in the 16th and 17th centuries who smeared the ointment with the expectation of becoming a wolf could easily have hallucinated the transformation, and confessed to it afterwards as a fact." Some pages further they write: "the occurrence of one or two violent deaths (however caused) would be enough to bring about the trial and execution of the unfortunate sufferer from porphyria."[76] They do not try to reconcile the different lists of symptoms and it would have been helpful if they had clarified which explanations should take precedence in the various circumstances, since the notion of a hallucinating porphyria sufferer who was bitten by a rabid animal is obviously too extreme.

The inadequacy of the individual theories is not lessened by their amalgamation. Indeed, other werewolf authors exhibit clear preferences and in the process they execrate anyone who does not share their view. Basil Copper thinks that the phenomenon of feral children, "though only peripheral to the legend of the werewolf, must have added a great deal to the lore surrounding this terrifying creature."[77] According to Ian Woodward, who favors the rabies theory,

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

"to try and correlate the behaviour of wolf–children with werewolves would not only be spuriously contrived and misleading, but downright dishonest."[78] Adam Douglas, who supports a "mythological" approach, dismisses porphyria by observing that "Dr Illis's ingenious theory is hampered by the lack of anything lupine about it."[79]

What the different theories have in common is imprecision and a tendency to lose sight of their object. The hallucinogen thesis is equally valid for witches as it is for werewolves. Sufferers from porphyria and attacks by rabid life forms might, according to the theorists, as well have been attributed to vampires as to werewolves. Psychiatrists are confusing lycanthropy with demonic possession,[80] a mistake that was derived from Summers but partly disguised because it was thrown together with "work of the Devil" (which in its vagueness is more accurate). They are also only marginally concerned with the particular kind of animal their patients said to have changed into. And would feral children not also have lent credibility to legends about the medieval Wild Man? Specific shapes become blurred in the process and, without forms to relate to, the theories themselves grow insubstantial. Of course, it could be argued, a werewolf is nothing more than a shape-shifting witch and vampires are rumored to take the shape of a wolf. But they only do so in very specific settings and the theories purport to have more general application. Werewolves also become extremely marginal to the point of disappearing altogether when seen from the other side of the presumed relationship. Not only are they often absent from studies about feral children or porphyria, they fail to figure in analyses of historical ergot poisoning or rabies. Unless, of course, one rebaptizes hypertrichosis as "the werewolf syndrome," which is not very complimentary to both its sufferers and those to whom a concept of the werewolf was part of their cultural repertoire.

Along with the werewolves, the people who spoke of them also faded away, at least in the sense that their opinions are steamrollered. Werewolf authors exhibit a very condescending attitude toward their historical subjects, especially when trying to impose their present-day interpretations on the past. This assumption of the credulous observer is a more general feature of recent popular werewolf historiography. Eisler, for one, does not have any trouble declaring that "ancient medicine would naturally confuse this form of psychosis with contagious canine rabies."[81] "It is easy to see how people afflicted by hypertrichosis at the time when the disorder was not understood, could be mistaken for werewolves—although the rarity of the disease rules out this happening on a large scale," wrote Woodward.[82] About feral children similar remarks are made, such as this by Copper: "The peasantry, among whom they were first discovered,

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

we may be sure, would have had terrified reactions and would have grouped them instinctively with the werewolf of the lonely forest, a monster with which their forebears had been familiar for centuries." Sidky echoed this twenty years later: "During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this condition could easily have been misconstrued as lycanthropy."[83] Douglas has rightly opposed this with the proposition that early modern people were quite capable of distinguishing between a werewolf and someone with ergot poisoning or rabies, or a feral child,[84] a position that deserves to be taken seriously despite the lack of direct evidence provided by this author. As Linda Godfrey worded it in her brief survey, "The afflicted people are still people, and always recognized as such. It's just very hard to mistake any human for a wolf."[85] Yet on the whole, theories are little discussed as to their relation to werewolves; they are merely reported and a critical approach is shunned.

Far from contributing to a history of werewolves, popular werewolf books create their own history in their voracious approach and unlimited copying from one another. Their main development is that they have become shorter and more illustrated. They rehash existing theories, without adding much. Their sense of history consists of the opposition between the present day and the "dark, superstitious Middle Ages," pretending, for instance, that the witch and werewolf trials were conducted by the "Medieval Inquisition"[86] (they fell, of course, under the jurisdiction of the secular courts and were held in the early modern period). The occasional exception to this way of presenting history still suffers from an erroneous theory and too stark a contrast between "science" and "superstition":

> When superstition ruled the courts, thousands of people were accused of the crime of werewolfism. Reaching a peak between 1520 and 1630, hundreds of innocent people were burned at the stake in an epidemic of popular paranoia. But being accused, and even convicted, does not always mean that the crime truly happened. . . .It was a time when religion, not science, was the arbiter of truth, and the Christian scriptures were . . . the final word on every subject. Most theologians agreed that people couldn't physically change their human body into a wolf's body. It was, they thought, all an illusion—a trick played by the arch-trickster, the Devil and his minions—black magic, in fact.[87]

To this particular English author and parapsychologist, who writes in small sound bites, judicial history does not seem to exist. He also still finds the space

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

to include ergot and children raised by wolves, and thinks that the "way most werewolves infect people is by biting at their throat, which is also the point of attack by which the rabies virus reaches the brain."[88] Again, the twentieth-century film is main basis for the argument here.

In a sense, the materialist explanations of werewolves are hardly different from references to "salivary" or "ductless" glands in fiction;[89] they do not so much explain as produce interesting-sounding words that in the final analysis may be meaningful for their authors but are meaningless in relation to werewolves. They are all based on extremely selective reading of the available historical material or on no material at all. They negate historical actors and contexts and fail to situate the snippets of information they have collected. The result is confusion. The concept of the timeless werewolf, defined by unchanging symptoms, is impossible to sustain. Present-day propagators of "the truth behind werewolves" ostensibly have movie werewolves in mind and relate more to the contemporary issues that confront their authors than to anything in the past.

VI

The authors discussed show an approach to history that is not only materialistic and reductionist but also anachronistic and more concerned with preoccupations of their own society than with anything in the past. Eisler and the Russells both referred to recent reports about rabies on the European continent,[90] which reflects the English paranoia about the infection and an inclination to project fears onto specific others. The connection between werewolves and rabies will have derived from and further sustained by the werewolf movies starting with *The Werewolf of London* (USA 1935), in which a bite from one werewolf passes on the symptoms to another. Contagious werewolves were certainly not traditional. Biting, as a novelist remarks, is "the one method of becoming a werewolf that the legends *don't* mention" and she then blames Hollywood for mixing up lycanthropy with vampirism.[91] Both motifs were inserted into the first major Hammer werewolf film, *The Curse of the Werewolf* (UK 1961), which werewolf portrayal may have given Illis the idea of a porphyria sufferer. Not only did the English film appear shortly before Illis presented his theory,[92] as it was in color it presented a clearer image than the black-and-white werewolf of the earlier American films.

It is therefore possible to detect the influence of the visual, movie-generated werewolf image on theories that focus on the werewolf's appearance. Since

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

werewolf makeup had to be invented from scratch, it provided viewers with the first available impression of how the beast looked: a hairy, distorted, humanlike creature walking on two legs, clothed, but uttering incomprehensible sounds. Theories about feral children and sufferers from porphyria and hypertrichosis suited this new visuality, were shaped by it, and in their turn perpetuated it. The change in werewolf makeup in the early 1970s from a visible face to one covered in long hair, as well as the lengthening of the beast's hair in general, is reflected by the switch in theory from porphyria to just hypertrichosis.[93] Similarly, Dolphin's image of the vampire was modeled on Bram Stoker's book and subsequent vampire movies, not on early modern vampires.[94]

Yet another present-day concern is noticeable in the hallucinogen theories; the "1960s 'drug culture' generation," as it was called,[95] clearly inspired the concept of the drug-induced werewolf experience. Psychiatric patients expressed the impact of contemporary culture more than their consultants are aware, in the way that they react to the full moon, or complain of having been "bitten by a rabid dog" and a feeling "as if hairs are growing all over my body."[96] Another patient believed "that his original experience represented an attack by a werewolf. Since then he has wondered whether he might be turning into a werewolf himself."[97] Psychiatrist Richard Noll was struck by the finding that werewolf cases only started to reappear during the mid-1970s. He ascribed this to the improved psychiatric understanding of "dissociative phenomena of all types."[98] Earlier psychiatric manifestations of animal metamorphosis may have been differently classified and thus not easily identifiable by later researchers. But the forms in which the delusion revealed itself were certainly in accordance with the time.

The link between theory and film exceeds the visual "Wolf Man" aspect: basically, both theory and film feed on a paucity of material. As a result, theorists tend to ignore or at least to marginalize films, since the latter would expose their conclusions as fantasy. Instead, supporting "evidence" has to be found in the indistinct past or in exotic locations. Otten relegated films to a similar status as "legends and myths," assigns both to periods "when there is no threat from werewolves to the tranquillity of communal life," and disregards films in the rest of her *Lycanthropy Reader*.[99] Those who argue that ergot, porphyria, hypertrichosis, or feral children were the "real" causes of the werewolf phenomenon take care not to draw on cinematic traditions for their supporting material for fear of losing credibility. Although it is only in films that the werewolf condition is transmitted by biting, rabies theorists ignore them. Extremely hairy werewolves featured in films before the invention of the hypertrichosis thesis.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Psychiatric patients with lycanthropic afflictions display a basic knowledge of werewolf films, but psychiatrists do not seem to be aware of it. Douglas grants the moon the central place in the werewolf's history and insists that the creature originated in prehistoric times from "the power of such goddesses as Ishtar and Artemis to transform men into animals" (both of whom he regards as moon goddesses); yet he finds films "something of a joke."[100] According to Curran, "There is little doubt that werewolf transformations were viewed in the 17th and 18th centuries as being supernaturally influenced by the waxing and waning of the moon."[101] He mentions only a handful of werewolf films and does not provide a source for his conclusion about the early modern lunatic werewolf.

In their different ways "nonfiction" werewolf writers, whatever explanation they favor, all deny their indebtedness to screenwriters Robert Harris (*Werewolf of London*, USA 1935) and Curt Siodmak (*The Wolf Man*, USA 1941) and their followers and imitators. Some films, in their turn, have been more open to speculative literature. *I Was a Teenage Werewolf* (USA 1957) with its unscrupulous scientist contains references to Eisler's book. *Legend of the Werewolf* (UK 1975) let its werewolf grow up as a feral child. This will be the one instance were the relation between werewolf image and theory went against the general trend. With its "bloodlines" and genetic justifications, the *Underworld* series (USA 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012) even created its own science.

An important aspect of the proliferation of popular werewolf publications and dubious werewolf theories is the lack of an academic counterweight based on serious and serial historical research. One of the reasons werewolves has not been studied as thoroughly as witches, although the same sources inform both, is that werewolves occur only in a very small number of the witch trials and then only in specific areas. In Germany, where as far as is known now the majority of werewolves were prosecuted, they have received hardly any attention.[102] Among the Scottish witch trials, to mention just one example, no werewolves have been unearthed. On the other hand, especially witchcraft studies show that the intensity of recent historical research has very little effect on the endurance of inaccurate popular notions. The problem clearly goes deeper.

Here I will only suggest a rough hypothesis: since the dominant academic culture is still scientific and prefers results to be quantifiable, it disqualifies werewolves (and a number of other "occult" or "esoteric" topics) as a proper subject of research within the academy but also stimulates theories that purport to be scientific. History, the history of everyday life in particular, has a low status and is not generally seen as a profession that requires rigorous standards. There is no inhibition against seeing the past with present eyes. At the same time, the

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

entertainment industry offers strong, competing images of historical concepts. This raises a number of interesting issues that fall outside the scope of this essay.

NOTES

Willem de Blécourt is Honorary Research Fellow at the Meertens Institute, Amsterdam.

1. Recent titles include Katie Boyd, *Werewolves: Myth, Mystery, and Magick* (Atglen: Schiffer, 2011); Nathan Robert Brown, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Werewolves* (New York: Penguin, 2009); Bob Curran: *Werewolves: A Field Guide to Shapeshifters, Lycanthropes, and Man-Beasts* (Pompton Plains: Career Press, 2009); Zachary Graves, *Werewolves* (Eastbourne: Canary Press, 2011); John Izzard, *Werewolves* (London: Spruce, 2009); Serena Valentino, *How to Be a Werewolf* (Dorking: Templar 2010).

2. Wilhelm Hertz, *Der Werwolf: Beitrag zur Sagengeschichte* (Stuttgart: Kröner, 1862), reprinted in 1973, 1995, and 2008; Sabine Baring-Gould, *The Book of Were-Wolves* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1865), reprinted in 1965, 1973, 1992, and 2006; Montague Summers, *The Werewolf* (London: Routledge, 1933), reprinted in 1944, 1966, 1983, and 2003.

3. See the chapters in Robin Briggs, *The Witches of Lorraine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Johanna Koppenhöfer, *Die mitleidlose Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1995); Rolf Schulte, *Man as Witch: Male Witches in Central Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009).

4. Willem de Blécourt, "'I Would Have Eaten You Too': Werewolf Legends in the Flemish, Dutch, and German Area," *Folklore* 118 (2007): 23–43; Michèle Simonsen, "Danish Werewolves Between Beliefs and Narratives," *Fabula* 51 (2010): 225–34.

5. Chantal Bourgault du Coudray, *The Curse of the Werewolf: Fantasy, Horror, and the Beast Within* (New York: I. B. Taurus, 2006); Hannah Priest, ed., *She-Wolf: Female Werewolves, Shapeshifters, and Other Horrors* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, forthcoming).

6. Among other publications, see Leslie A. Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf: A Literary Study From Antiquity Through the Renaissance* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2008).

7. Emily D. Edwards, *Metaphysical Media: The Occult Experience in Popular Culture* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005), 139–64; Bourgault du Coudray, *Curse of the Werewolf*, 65–90, 101–11, 121–24.

8. Stephen T. Asma, *On Monsters: An Unnatural History of Our Worst Fears* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 137. According to this author (p. 169), in his *Descent of Man* Darwin discussed this "werewolf syndrome," but Darwin did not even mention the term "werewolf."

9. For instance, H. Franklin Bunn, "Uros and Alas-2: Erstwhile Partners in Crime," *Blood: Journal of the American Society of Hematology*, August 11, 2011, citing Illis, see below.

10. "Lycanthropy" has been the label for a specific condition ever since it was described by Paulus Aegineta in the seventh century; see, for example, E. Poulakou-Rebelakou et al., "Lycanthropy in Byzantine Times (A.D. 330–1453)," *History of Psychiatry* 20 (2009): 468–79. However, a continuous tradition up to the late twentieth century is absent, and the recent cases have a different set of symptoms. In as far as a lycanthropy tradition can be indicated,

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

it was constricted to medical writers and not related to the "werewolves" that were, for instance, subject to prosecution.

11. Petra Garlipp, Detlev E. Dietrich, and Horst Haltenhof, "Lykanthropie," in Petra Garlipp and Horst Haltenhoff, eds., *Seltene Wahnstörungen: Psychopathologie–Diagnostik–Therapie* (Heidelberg: Steinkopf, 2010), 22–26.

12. Brown, *Complete Idiot's Guide to Werewolves*, 209–20; Boyd, *Werewolves*, 115–27.

13. See Curran, *Werewolves*, 185–98; and Izzard, *Werewolves*. Linda S. Godfrey, *Werewolves* (New York: Checkmark, 2008), 49–51, mentions this theory but discards it.

14. Nancy W. Burkhart, "Oh My! Vampires and Werewolves," *RDH* 30, no. 9 (September 2010), http://www.rdhmag.com/articles/print/volume-30/issue-9/columns/oh-my-vampires-and-werewolves.html.

15. Stacy E. Foran and György Ábel, "Guide to Porphyrias: A Historical and Clinical Perspective," *American Journal of Clinical Pathology* 119 (2003): suppl. 86–93.

16. See Zohra Zaidi and Sean W. Lanigan, *Dermatology in Clinical Practice* (London: Springer, 2010), 327; and Robert K. Murray et al., *Harper's Illustrated Biochemistry*, 28th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Medical, 2009), 275, though here it is remarked that "no evidence to support this notion has been adduced."

17. Rosemary Ellen Guiley, *The Encyclopedia of Vampires and Werewolves*, 2nd ed. (New York: Checkmark Books, 2011), 281. See also *Transformations* (Alexandria: Time-Life Books, 1989), 93–94; and Brad Steiger, *The Werewolf Book: The Encyclopedia of Shape-Shifting Beings* (Detroit: Visible Ink, 1999), 218.

18. L. Illis, "On Porphyria and the Aetiology of Werwolves," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 57 (1964) (Section of the History of Medicine): 23–26, esp. 24. Otten's edition of Illis's paper left out the werewolf half; see Charlotte F. Otten, ed., *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 195–99.

19. Alb. C. Kruijt, "De weerwolf bij de Toradjas van Midden-Celebes," *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land-, en volkenkunde* 41 (1899): 548–67. See also Alb. C. Kruijt and Nicolaus Adriani, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmij, 1950), 430–47.

20. The original French text has *esgratigneures*, which translates as "scratches" rather than "excoriations"; cf. the Ashwin translation, Henry Boguet, *Examen of Witches* (London: Rodker, 1929), 151.

21. Illis, "On Porphyria and the Aetiology of Werwolves," 24.

22. Dolphin, who had previously written a book on porphyria, does not seem to have published his ideas about vampires and werewolves, and only gave this public lecture, which was widely reported at the time. See Ann M. Cox, "Porphyria and Vampirism: Another Myth in the Making," *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 1995, 643–44, who quotes an article in the *New York Times*, May 31, 1985.

23. Norine Dresser, *American Vampires: Fans, Victims, and Practitioners* (New York: Norton, 1989), 193.

24. Ibid., 185. It concerns the episode 10 in season 4, "Loss of Power," first aired on December 11, 1985.

25. Ibid., 182.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

26. Brown, *Complete Idiot's Guide to Werewolves*, 211. Perhaps typical for the depth of research this book features de Blécourt's nonexistent study "*Werewolves* (London: Hambledon, 2005)" in its "Further Reading" list (205).

27. Patricia Cornwell, *The Last Precinct* (New York: Berkley, 2001), 145.

28. Season 6, episode 11, "Werewolves," first aired January 5, 2006.

29. Cf. Schulte, *Man as Witch*, 1–35.

30. Cf. Wolfgang Schild, "Missetäter und Wolf," in Gerhard Köbler and Herman Nehlsen, eds., *Wirkungen europäischer Rechtskultur* (Munich: Beck, 1997), 999–1031.

31. Basil Copper, *The Werewolf: In Legend, Fact, and Art* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1977), 87.

32. Robert Eisler, *Man into Wolf: An Anthropological Interpretation of Sadism, Masochism, and Lycanthropy* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951), 81, 33.

33. H. Sidky, *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs, and Disease: An Anthropological Study of the European Witch-Hunts* (New York: Lang, 1997), 241, cited from Baring-Gould, *Book of Were-Wolves*, 97. Cf. the translation in Caroline Oates, "The Trial of a Teenage Werewolf, Bordeaux, 1603," *Criminal Justice History* 9 (1988): 1–29, esp. 22. This last article is still the most accurate account of the Grenier case to date.

34. Curran, *Werewolves*, 197.

35. Authors discussing the full moon as the facilitator of the werewolf metamorphosis usually refer to two texts to support a long history: Petronius's *Satyricon*, and the *Otia Imperalia* of Gervase of Tilbury. This is another example of bending evidence to theory: Petronius merely mentioned that the moon was shining brightly and did not indicate any phase. Gervase wrote about phases (in plural) and not about the full moon in particular; cf. Keith Roberts, "Eine Werwolf-Formel: Eine kleine Kulturgeschichte des Werwolfs," in Ulrich Müller and Werner Wunderlich, eds., *Dämonen, Monster, Fabelwesen* (St. Gallen: Fachverlag für Wissenschaft und Studium, 1999), 565–81.

36. Eisler, *Man into Wolf*, 34.

37. Ian Woodward, *The Werewolf Delusion* (New York: Paddington, 1979), 164, 166. Cf. Brown, *Complete Idiot's to Werewolves*, 214–18, where a "hypothetical scenario" is presented that does not fit any known werewolf descriptions.

38. Sidky, *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs, and Disease*, 245.

39. The most comprehensive list can be found at http://www.elmar-lorey.de/Prozesse.htm, last accessed March 4, 2012.

40. A geographical correlation has also been suggested between werewolf trials and later recordings of the story of Little Red Riding Hood; see Jack Zipes, ed., *The Trials and Tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood* (London: Routledge, 1993), 20; this is equally far-fetched.

41. Summers, *Werewolf*, 50, quotes the German physician Daniel Sennert.

42. Michael J. Harner, "The Role of Hallucinogenic Plants in European Witchcraft," in *Hallucinogens and Shamanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 141.

43. Frida G. Surawicz and Richard Banta, "Lycanthropy Revisited," in Otten, *Lycanthropy Reader*, 34–40, reprinted in Richard Noll, *Vampires, Werewolves, and Demons: Twentieth-Century Reports in the Psychiatric Literature* (New York: Brunner and Mazel, 1992), 101–11.

44. Otten, *Lycanthropy Reader*, 26–27.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

45. Summers, *Werewolf*, 109. In this book Summers included a short article by H. J. Norman, "Witch Ointments." The conclusion of this last author was "that the witches' armamentarium was by no means an ineffective one" (292).

46. Adam Douglas, *The Beast Within: A History of the Werewolf* (London: Chapmans, 1992), 222.

47. Harner, "Role of Hallucinogenic Plants in European Witchcraft," 144; Sidky, *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs, and Disease*, 248.

48. W. M. S. Russell and Claire Russell, "The Social Biology of Werewolves," in J. R. Porter and W. M. S. Russell, eds., *Animals in Folklore* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1978), 143–82, esp. 168.

49. Harner, "Role of Hallucinogenic Plants in European Witchcraft," 141, from Summers, *Werewolf*, 39, quoting the Byzantine author Paulus Aegineta.

50. See note 10. At this point it is possible only to make a statement; supporting trial evidence can be found through the list mentioned in note 39.

51. Jean Céard, "Aux sources de Jean de Nynauld," in Jean de Nynauld, *De la lycantropie, transformation, et extase des sorciers, 1615* (Paris: Frénésie, 1990), 51–52; Johann Weyer, *De prestigiis daemonum*, trans. John Shea (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1991), 226.

52. Harner, "Role of Hallucinogenic Plants in European Witchcraft," 145.

53. De Nynauld, *De la lycanthropie, transformation, et extase des sorciers*, 95.

54. Harner, "Role of Hallucinogenic Plants in European Witchcraft," 144; Summers, *Werewolf*, 99.

55. Michel Meurger, "L'homme-loup et son témoin: Construction d'une factualité lycanthropique," in de Nynauld, *De la lycanthropie, transformation, et extase des sorciers*, 143–79, esp. 145n4.

56. Weyer, *De prestigiis daemonum*, 513.

57. Woodward, *Werewolf Delusion*, 125. This is a reworking of a passage from Baring-Gould, *Book of Were-Wolves*, 150. In his turn, Baring-Gould was inspired by Rud. Leubuscher, *Über die Werwölfe und Thierverwandlungen im Mittelalter: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Psychologie* (Berlin: Reimer, 1850), 55.

58. Elmar Lorey, "Vom Wolfssegner zum Werwolf," in Rita Voltmer and Günther Gehl, eds., *Alltagsleben und Magie in Hexenprozessen* (Weimar: Dadder, 2003), 65–79.

59. Sidky, *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs, and Disease*, 249.

60. Statement ascribed to Mary Matossian, author of *Poisons of the Past* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), which takes a favorable position about ergot poisoning as cause of the witch craze, cited from the *National Examiner*, April 6, 1997, in Steiger, *Werewolf Book*, 105. Matossian does not mention any werewolves in her book.

61. Douglas, *Beast Within*, 235.

62. Steiger, *Werewolf Book*, 105; Some other publications that mention the figure are Godfrey, *Werewolves*; Rosalyn Greene, *The Magic of Shapeshifting* (York Beach: Weiser, 2000); Cecil Helman, *Body Myths* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1991); Gabriel Ronay, *The Dracula Myth* (New York: Allen, 1972); and Brian Ward, "Werewolves: A Culture-Bound Psychosis," *World Medicine* 8, no. 18 (1973): 43–55.

63. Schulte, *Man as Witch*, 23–32.

64. See note 4.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

65. Harner, "Role of Hallucinogenic Plants in European Witchcraft," 141.

66. Garlipp, Dietrich, and Haltenhof, "Lykanthropie"; see also the following notes 66, 68–71, 79, and 95–96. In another recent essay, "Lycanthropy in Depression," by Ali-Reza Moghaddas and Mitra Nasseri, *Archives of Iranian Medicine* 7, no. 2 (2004): 130–32, a reference is made to W. M. Davis et al., "Psychopharmacology of Lycanthropy," *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 146 (1992): 1192–97; the prime importance of this last essay, cowritten by the "authors" Wellwuff and Garew, is that it appeared on the first of April.

67. Harvey A. Rosenstock and Kenneth R. Vincent, "A Case of Lycanthropy," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 134 (1977): 1147–49; P. G. Coll, G. O. Sullivan, and P. J. Browne, "Lycanthropy Lives On," *British Journal of Psychiatry* 147 (1985): 201–2; Paul E. Keck, Harrison G. Pope, James I. Hudson, Susan L. McElroy, and Aaron R. Kulick, "Lycanthropy: Alive and Well in the Twentieth Century," *Psychological Medicine* 18 (1988): 9–17, esp. 114; Hamdy F. Moselhy and J. Fiona Macmillan, "Lycanthropy, Mythology, and Medicine," *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine* 11 (1994): 168–70.

68. Otten, *Lycanthropy Reader*, 5, 14.

69. Keck et al., "Lycanthropy," 113; T. Gödeke-Koch, P. Garlipp, H. Haltenhof, and D. E. Dietrich, "Lycanthropy: 2 Case Reports," *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 46 (2001): 659.

70. Peter M. Yellowlees, "Werewolves Down Under: Where Are They Now?" *Medical Journal of Australia* 151 (1989): 663.

71. T. R. Dening and A. West, "Multiple Serial Lycanthropy," *Psychopathology* 22 (1989): 344–47.

72. H. Verdoux and M. Bourgeois, "A Partial Form of Lycanthropy with Hair Delusion in a Manic-Depressive Patient," *British Journal of Psychiatry* 163 (1993): 684–86; Hamdy F. Moselhy, "Lycanthropy: New Evidence of its Origin," *Psychopathology* 32 (1999): 173–76; J. Arturo Silva, Dennis V. Derecho, and Gregory B. Leong, "A Case of Partial Lycanthropy," *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 45 (2000): 201–2.

73. Moselhy and Macmillan, "Lycanthropy, Mythology, and Medicine," 169.

74. Otten, *Lycanthropy Reader*, 284.

75. W. M. S. Russell and Claire Russell, "The Social Biology of Werewolf Trials," *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 82 (1989): 379.

76. Russell and Russell, "Social Biology of Werewolves," 168, 169, 171.

77. Copper, *Werewolf*, 83. The wordplay obscures the similarities between "legend" and "lore."

78. Woodward, *Werewolf Delusion*, 31–32.

79. Douglas, *Beast Within*, 237.

80. Aaron R. Kulick, M. D. Harrison, G. Pope Jr., and Paul E. Keck, "Lycanthropy and Self-Identification," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 178 (1990): 137–37; K. H. Koehler, H. Ebel and D. Vartzopoulos, "Lycanthropy and Demonomania: Some Psychopathological Issues," *Psychological Medicine* 20 (1990): 629–33; Verdoux and Bourgeois, "A Partial Form of Lycanthropy with Hair Delusion in a Manic-Depressive Patient."

81. Eisler, *Man into Wolf*, 34.

82. Woodward, *Werewolf Delusion*, 52.

83. Copper, *Werewolf*, 110; Sidky, *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs, and Disease*, 241.

84. Douglas, *Beast Within*, 235–36.

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

85. Godfrey, *Werewolves*, 55.

86. Ibid., 37.

87. Izzard, *Werewolves*, 118. The years refer to the thirty thousand theory; see above.

88. Ibid., 45.

89. James Blish, "There Shall Be No Darkness," in Bill Pronzini, ed., *Werewolf!* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979), 105, 111 (originally published in *Thrilling Wonder Stories*, April 1950); cf. the film *The Beast Must Die* (USA 1974); Brad Strickland, "And the Moon Shines Full and Bright," in Byron Preiss, ed., *The Ultimate Werewolf* (London: Headline, 1992), 307.

90. Eisler, *Man into Wolf*, 166; *Evening Press*, September 17, 1947; Russell and Russell, "Social Biology of Werewolves," 163; *TV Times*, July 19–25, 1975.

91. Margaret L. Carter, *Shadow of the Beast: A Werewolf Novel* (Darien, Ill.: Desin Image Group, 1998), 173.

92. The conceptual link with horror films, though not in detail, was already indicated by the London correspondent of the Canadian Medical Association; see S. S. B. Gilder, "Werewolves and Disease," *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 90 (1964): 1234.

93. Cf. *The Curse of the Werewolf* (UK 1961) with *The Boy Who Cried Werewolf* (USA 1971); images in Stephen Jones, *The Illustrated Werewolf Movie Guide* (London: Titan Books, 1996), 54–59, 77–78.

94. Dresser, *American Vampires*, 194.

95. Sidky, *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs, and Disease*, 248.

96. Michel Benezech et al., "A Lycanthropic Murderer," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 146 (1989): 942.

97. Rosenstock and Vincent, "Case of Lycanthropy," 1148; Hamdy F. Moselhy, "Lycanthropy: New Evidence of its Origin," *Psychopathology* 32 (1999): 173–76. The last author reflects that this "might represent the first case of lycanthropic intermetamorphosis"; he may want to watch a werewolf film.

98. Noll, *Vampires, Werewolves, and Demons*, 91.

99. Otten, *Lycanthropy Reader*, 4. She explicitly refrained from calling her volume "A Werewolf Reader" to avoid association with horror movies; see p. 1.

100. Douglas, *Beast Within*, 260.

101. Curran, *Werewolves*, 170.

102. The two book-length studies are written by non-historians: Elmar Lorey, *Henrich der Werwolf: Eine Geschichte aus der Zeit der Hexenprozesse mit Dokumenten und Analysen* (Frankfurt: Anabas, 1998); and Sabine Richter, *Werwölfe und Zaubertänze: Vorchristliche Glaubensvorstellungen in Hexenprozessen der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt: Lang, 2004).

This content downloaded from
132.174.254.145 on Sat, 18 Jan 2025 22:39:55 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms